UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,034	12/28/2001	Peter Gassner	021756-017130US	2584

51206 7590 12/23/2008

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
VU, TUAN A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/041,034	GASSNER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TUAN A. VU	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 November 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *4-12,15-17,19-23,26-31,41-48,60-64,71-74 and 80-86* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *4-6, 7-12, 15-17, 19-23, 26-31, 41-48, 60-64, 71-74, 80-86* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Applicant's response filed 11/07/08.

As indicated in Applicant's response, claims 4-7, 9-10, 15-17, 21, 23, 27, 29, 30, 31, 38,40-41, 43-45, 47, 60-61, 71, 73, 78-80 have been amended, and claims 81-86 added. Claims 4-6, 7-12, 15-17, 19-23, 26-31, 41-48, 60-64, 71-74, 80-86 are pending in the office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 4-12, 15-17, 19-20, 78-79, 81-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

> The Federal Circuit has recently applied the practical application test in determining whether the claimed subject matter is statutory under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The practical application test requires that a " useful, concrete, and tangible result" be accomplished. An "abstract idea" when practically applied is eligible for a patent. As a consequence, an invention, which is eligible for patenting under 35 U.S.C. § 101, is in the "useful arts" when it is a machine, manufacture, process or composition of matter, which produces a concrete, tangible, and useful result. The test for practical application is thus to determine whether the claimed invention produces a "useful, concrete and tangible result".

The current focus of the Patent Office in regard to statutory inventions under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for method claims and claims that recite a judicial exception (software) is that the claimed invention recite a practical application. Practical application can be provided by a physical transformation or a useful, concrete and tangible result. The following link on the World Wide Web is the United States Patent And Trademark Office (USPTO) reference in terms of guidelines on a proper analysis on 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection.

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/guidelines101_20051026.pdf>

Specifically, claim 4 recites system comprising a *personalization engine* and *user profile interface*, a *Internet application server* and a *web application server;* none of which servers

perceived from the disclosure as NW components implemented with hardware per se. The claim recites a *data repository* which in light of the Disclosure amounts to a RDBM 320, which cannot be equated to a storage medium. Absent explicit and specific teaching regarding how the claim as a whole is supported by hardware in order to carry out the functionality of user interfaces, servers and databases, the claim cannot constitute a system that actually realizes the software components as observed above to yield real-world result required for fulfilling a statutory type Practical Application . Listing of mere software components amounts to 'Functional Descriptive Material' (see USC 101 Guidelines, Annex IV, pg. 54-55) which cannot be categorized as one of the four permissible and statutory categories of subject matter.

Likewise, claim 7 recites a system comprising application system allowing element a application user interface to be modified, application designer, personalization engine, user profile interface, data repository and application user interfaces. All of the elements recited are construed as implemented in software, and the claimed system as a whole amounts to mere listing of "Descriptive Functional Material' and is rejected for leading to a non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 15 is a system comprising Internet Application server, application user interface, metadata, and repository of data record. As set forth in the rejection of claim 4, the system as a whole amounts to listing of software-implemented components. Claim 15 for the same reasons is rejected for not belonging to any statutory categories of subject matter.

Claims 5-6, 78-79, 81, 8-12, 16-17, 19-20, 82-83 are also rejected for failing to include hardware support to the system base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 4-12, 78-79, 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 4 and 7 recite 'personalization system … operable *to deliver* a user profile interface to a client device of a user … profile interface allowing the user to modify personalization data …' . According to the Specifications, personalization system (Specifications: pg. 7, para 0017) integrates personalization engine and profile interface (see Fig. 13E) to allow modifying tab-order by the user, such profile interface one interfaces among other application user interfaces (Fig. 13A-D) delivered by the Web application server 309 (see Fig. 3). Emphasis is added to the portion (Specs: para 0056 pg. 26) stating that the *personalization system* 'is accessed through the profile interface 270' and that this *personalization system* includes a personalization engine and user profile interface (Fig. 2), both of which optionally integrated in the internet applications accessed by the invention. That is, *internet applications* accessible by the invention cannot signify that the *personalization system* delivers this optional *user profile interface* to a requesting internet client. This 'personalization system' is not clearly disclosed as operable to **deliver** 'user profile interface' in light of the Web server 309 of Fig. 3. Therefore, the delivering by the *personalization system* is deemed not in possession by the

inventor at the time the invention was made. Because of the lack of proper support, the 'delivering' limitation is given no weight and rather treated as though the *personalization engine* is being operable (emphasis added) with the *user profile interface*.

Dependent claims 5-6, 8-12, 78-79, 81 fail to remedy to the lack of description as set forth above, and along with claims 4, 7 are rejected for the description requirement non-compliance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4-12, 82, 84-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauchamp, USPN: 6,621,505 (hereinafter Beauchamp).

As per claim 4, Beauchamp discloses a system for generating application user interfaces enabling customization of the user interfaces for each of a plurality of users, the system comprising:

a personalization system including a personalization engine and operable to deliver (Note: 'deliver' treated as operate with – see USC 112 Rejection) a user interface to a client device of a user for the plurality of users, the user interface being operable to allow the user to modify personalization data for that user (e.g. user specified processes, screen name – Fig. 3; Fig. 4-5; step 462 - Fig. 14B – Note: modification of screens provided from Universal Client based on user's selection, metadata specifications, and login session reads on personalization data

for that user), the personalization data characterizing at least one functional property of at least one user interface element (Fig. 4-5; col. 10 line 20 to col. 11 line 30; Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause, Cancel – Fig 14B – Note: interface element like screen content being navigated via buttons allowing further modifying – see col 27 lines 27-60; col 27 line 61 to col. 28 line 16; col 27 line 61 to col. 28 line 16 - and editing by users - based intended business process reads on functional property characterizing personalization data being modified) of the application user interface presented on the client device of that user;

an Internet application server (col. 17 lines 36-50; col. 18 lines 9-24, 49-57; col. 19 li. 31-45) operable to execute at least one selected Internet application of a plurality of Internet applications, the Internet application server including a user interface generator operable to generate at least one application user interface (e.g. Fig. 13; *request, define the screen, produce the screen* - col. 24 line 17-36; steps 412, 416 Fig. 14A – Note: parsing XML from request and using both back end server and submitting of response processed by Universal client reads on server operable to generate application user interface; i.e. *produce a screen*) for the selected Internet application (col. 25 lines 5-25 -Note: requesting client and selection thereby reads on internet application selected for the logged on client), customized for the user using metadata (e.g. col. 25 lines 29-38) for the at least one application user interface, and the personalization data (step 432, step 462, Fig. 14B – Note: user selecting from a list enabling *Universal Client* to collect proper data along with metadata-based package and screens for the logged on user – step 408 Fig. 14B - reads on generating of personalization data) for the user requesting the at least one application user interface using the client device;

a data repository including a data record for storing the personalization data for the user, the data record being accessible using the metadata (col 19 lines 45-47; col 25 lines 4-5; Fig. 8); and

a web server operable to deliver the customized application user interface to the client device of the user (e.g. col. 17 lines 36-50; Fig 13 – Note: server to transmit response enabling Universal Client to render screen – see Fig. 3-5).

But Beauchamp does not explicitly disclose that the user interface operable within the personalization system is *user profile interface*, enabling user to modify personalization data for that user through this *user profile interface*.

Based on the storage of personalized data (col. 21 lines 50-54; Customer Specific 604, Fig. 16; *security profiles* – col. 18 lines 30-37) in the repository accessible by metadata and request, and delivering of response by a server to accommodate user's request (Fig. 8, 13) as well as modifying of the delivered screen by modifying a property representing a GUI element as set forth above, the concept and role played by the person of a user in terms of his/her identity being recorded in database for processes based on personal security access or personal type data as in business transactions (e.g. *data ...represent a customer, address contact information invoice accounts* - col. 21 lines 39-58) is indicative of user profile. It would have been obvious for one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the user screen and repository system in Beauchamp, so that user interface being be treated as a profile type interface provided in the personalization system so that it would be implementing profile-based application for a particular logged on and registered user, such that the property being personalized using said user profile interface could be modified and otherwise customized via

the GUI elements – i.e. button clicking as set forth above (Fig. 14B), because this type of profile based screen customization would fall under the applicability contemplated in the process by Beauchamp, shown in terms of business transactions or individual data type spread-sheeting instances pertinent to one given user (see Vendor, Weekly price, Fig. 2; user calendar, Journee Client – Fig. 5; specified purposes … business objects – col. 6 lines 49-65; col. 9 lines 31-35) in conjunction with profile data for that user.

As per claims 5-6, Beauchamp discloses wherein the functional property includes interaction model (Fig. 14A, B); wherein the interaction model determines the timing of delivery of data input on the user application interface between the client device and the web server, the model being a deferred (non-immediate) interaction model for delivery from the client to the server (e.g. *user pauses* - col. 17 lines 51-67; col. 18, lines 38-67; Fig. 7 – Note: modification by user interface so that data received at server as a result of pause is delayed **reads on** property of a deferred interaction mode, i.e. a functional property of at least one user interface element of the application user interface).

As per claim 7, Beauchamp discloses a system for developing an Internet application including an application user interface with a customizable interaction model, the system comprising:

an application development system operable to allow a developer to specify at least one user interface element to be included in the application user interface (Fig. 14A; step), the at least one user interface element being associated with an interaction model, the interaction model being customizable by each a user of a plurality of users (Fig. 4-5; col. 10 line 20 to col. 11 line 30; Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause, Cancel – Fig 14B; *customize the generic screens*

– col. 4 lines 44-46 - Note: interface element like screen content being navigated via buttons allowing further modifying – see col 27 lines 27-60; col 27 line 61 to col. 28 line 16 - and editing by users - based intended business process reads on functional property characterizing personalization data being modified) accessing the application user interface from a client device;

an application designer configured to produce metadata (Fig. 9; step 426 Fig. 14A; col. 19 lines 10-16; step 430 Fig. 14B) associated with the interaction model;

a personalization system including a personalization engine and operable to deliver a user interface to the client device of the user of the plurality of users, the user interface being operable to allow the user to modify personalization data for that user (refer to claim 4), the personalization data characterizing the interaction model for the user for the at least one user interface element included in the application user interface presented on the client device of the user (refer to claim 4);

a data repository including a data record configured to store the personalization data for each of the plurality of users, the data record being accessible using the metadata (e.g. col. 20 lines 28-47; col. 18 lines 30-37; *to represent a customer* – col. 21 lines 50; refer to claim 4),

wherein the application user interface contains different functionality of the at least one user interface element for different users (e.g. col. 4 lines 23-45; col. 9 lines 8-46; Fig. 2-5) depending upon the personalization data for those users.

But Beauchamp does not explicitly disclose that the user interface operable within the personalization system is *user profile interface*, enabling user to modify personalization data for

that user through this *user profile interface*. But this user profile interface limitation has been addressed in claim 4.

As per claim 8, Beauchamp discloses wherein the application development server is further configured to specify display of an interaction model control command (e.g. *how to render* -- col. 4 lines 49-60 Note: XML sent from server supporting rendering reads on control command - col. 24 line 17-36; *from the process server ... that are specified by the process data* - col 7 lines 29-40; Fig. 3-5- Note: screens specifically called for in processing of request by server, being sent therefrom and thus specified for display and rendering on the Universal client **reads on** specifying what to display as screen types by the server – see col 13 line 23 to col. 16, line 14; *may manage ... descendant attributes* – col. 18 lines 49-57; control process functionality – col 18 lines 24-29) in the application user interface, the interaction model control command being configured for each user to customize the interaction model.

As per claim 9, Beauchamp discloses wherein the interaction model customizable by each user allows selection from a deferred and immediate communication based interaction model between the client device and the Internet application for each user interface element, wherein the interaction model determines the timing of delivery, from the client device to the Internet application, of data input on the application user interface (refer to rejection of claim 6)

As per claim 10, Beauchamp discloses wherein the interaction model is configurable according to the identity of each user (step 400, 406 – Fig 14A) or the identity of the client device of the user.

As per claims 11-12, Beauchamp discloses wherein a state of the interaction model is further configurable to persist between uses (e.g. col 29 lines 48-57; col 18; *manage multiple*

versions - lines 13-21, lines 58-67; col 27 lines 41-60) of the application user interface; wherein the data record is further modifiable using a configuration system (massage - col 21 lines 48-67).

As per claim 82, (with reference to claim 15) Beauchamp does not disclose user profile interface delivered to the user on the client device enables the user to modify the personalization data. But based on the communication scheme in Beauchamp whereby repository include metadata relevant to instances of application related to personal transaction as set forth in Claim 4, the user profile being provided as part of the environment of the generated user interface for customization so to enable personalization data to be modified has been rendered obvious according to the rationale set forth therein.

As per claim 84, (with reference to claim 29), Beauchamp discloses a user profile interface delivered to the user on the client device enables the user to modify the personalization data (refer to claim 82).

As per claims 85-86, (with reference to claim 38, 60 respectively) refer to claim 82.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 15-17, 19-23, 26-27, 29-31, 38-48, 60-64, 71-74, 78-81, 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Beauchamp et al., USPN: 6,621,505 (hereinafter Beauchamp).

As per claim 15, Beauchamp discloses a system for generating a user interface, the system comprising:

an Internet application server operable to support an Internet application;

an application user interface generator operable to generate the user interface (steps 412, 416 Fig. 14A) for the Internet application for display on a client device of a user of a plurality of users, the user interface being generated using personalization data (Fig. 13; *request, define the screen, produce the screen* - col. 24 line 17-36 – Note: parsing XML from request and using both back end server and submitting of response processed by Universal client based on user's input reads on generator operable to generate application user interface using personalization data - col. 25 lines 5-25; step 432, step 462, Fig. 14B) for the user of the plurality of users, the personalization data being modifiable by the user of the plurality of users, wherein the personalization data characterizes at least one functional property of the user interface element of the user interface (Fig. 3-5; Fig. 14B - refer to claim 4 - Note: interface element like screen content being navigated via buttons allowing further modifying – see col 27 lines 27-60; col 27 line 61 to col. 28 line 16 - and editing by users - based intended *business process* reads on functional property characterizing personalization data being modified),

the at least one functional property including an interaction model between the client device and the Internet application server, wherein the interaction model is associated with the timing of delivery, from the client device to the Internet application server, of data input on the user interface (refer to claim 6);

metadata associated with the at least one functional property of the user interface element (col. 6 lines 56-65; col. 4 lines 49-60); and a data repository including a data record for storing

the personalization data for each of the plurality of users (e.g. col. 20 lines 28-47; col. 18 lines 30-37; *to represent a customer* – col. 21 lines 50; refer to claim 4),

wherein each user of the plurality of users is able to modify the personalization data such that the application user interface functions (col. 4 lines 23-45; col. 9 lines 8-46; Fig. 2-5) differently for different users.

As per claims 16-17, Beauchamp discloses wherein the user interface is configured for display on the client device using standard web browser protocols (HTTPS, Web server, HTTP – Fig. 7); using features of a web browser, the features not requiring (Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause, Cancel – Fig 14B) a browser add-on, plug-in, or extension.

As per claims 19-20, Beauchamp discloses including a configuration system configured to modify the data record (refer to claim 12); wherein the configuration system is included in the Internet application (Fig. 12 – Note: data communicated as message including personalization data and persisted as reusable metadata and modifiable in database reads no configuration system include in the paradigm encompassing this web application, the internet and XML).

As per claim 21, Beauchamp discloses an Internet application system having processor readable storage devices and processor readable code embedded therein for executing instructions on a computer system, comprising:

a user interface generator configured to generate an application user interface, the application user interface being compatible with a standard web browser (steps 412, 416 Fig. 14A; Fig. 3-5 Note: delivery and processing XML using Universal Client reads on web browser standard) and being generated in response to a request from a client device of a user of a plurality

of users, the user interface generator utilizing personalization data to generate the application user interface (refer to Claim 4);

a web application server configured to deliver the application user interface to the client device of each user (Fig. 14A-B; col. 17 lines 36-50; Fig 13 – Note: Universal Client reads on delivering by web server); and

an Internet application accessible to the user through the generated application user interface, wherein the user is able to modify the personalization data (Fig. 3-5; Fig. 14B - refer to claim 4 - Note: interface element like screen content being navigated via buttons allowing further modifying – see col 27 lines 27-60; col 27 line 61 to col. 28 line 16 - and editing by users - based intended *business process* reads on functional property characterizing personalization data being modified), the personalization data characterizing at least one functional property of the user interface, the at least one functional property including an interaction model between the client device and the Internet application system (refer to Claim 4),

wherein the interaction model is associated with the timing of delivery, from the client device to the Internet application server, of data input on the application user interface, such that the application user interface functions differently for different users (refer to claim 6 - Note: delay event – pause - from one user session reads on interface functioning differently with respect to other users).

As per claim 22, Beauchamp discloses wherein the user interface generator is further configured to use metadata to generate the application user interface (step 434 – Fig. 14B).

As per claim 23, Beauchamp discloses wherein the at least one functional property is specific to a user interface element included in the application user interface (step 434, 436 Fig. 14B).

As per claims 26-27, refer to claims 10 and 9, respectively.

As per claim 29, Beauchamp discloses a computer program product embedded in a computer readable medium for generating a customizable application user interface, comprising program code for:

generating an application user interface (Fig. 14A) including at least one user interface element customizable by a user of a plurality of users, the application user interface configured for delivery to a client device of the user and to operate as an interface between the user and an Internet application including the application user interface (Fig. 3-5);

allowing the user to modify personalization data for the user, the personalization data characterizing at least one functional property of the at least one user interface element (Fig. 3-5; Fig. 14B - refer to claim 4 - Note: interface element like screen content being navigated via buttons allowing further modifying – see col 27 lines 27-60; col 27 line 61 to col. 28 line 16 - and editing by users - based intended *business process* reads on functional property characterizing personalization data being modified), for use with the application user interface and any other application interface using the at least one user interface element (Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause, Cancel – Fig 14B);

storing in a data record the personalization data in a location physically remote from the client device of the user (e.g. col. 20 lines 28-47; col. 18 lines 30-37; *to represent a customer* – col. 21 lines 50; refer to claim 4); and

storing metadata (col. 6 lines 56-65; col. 4 lines 49-60) configurable for use by the user interface generator to access the data record,

wherein each user of the plurality of users is able to modify the personalization data (col. 4 lines 23-45; col. 9 lines 8-46; step 434 –Fig. 14B) such that the application user interface functions differently for different users (refer to claim 15).

As per claim 30, refer to claim 9 (deferred and immediate).

As per claim 31, refer to claim 10.

As per claim 38, Beauchamp discloses a method of developing an application user interface associated with an Internet application, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting an interaction model characterized by a data record (e.g. *various type of screens ... designated to implement a process* – col. 13 lines 23-27; from a client – col. 5 lines 21-30 – Note: screens rendered according to specification of user request reads on selecting a model), the data record being stored in a data repository (Process database 206 – Fig. 7; process database - col 5 lines 25-30) and being modifiable allowing a user of a plurality of users to modify at least one functional property of at least one user interface element in the application user interface (e.g. Fig. 4-5; col. 10 line 20 to col. 11 line 30; Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause, Cancel – Fig 14B), the data repository being physically remote from a client device of the user used to display the application user interface (refer to claim 29);

generating the application user interface for the user using the selected interaction model and the data record (e.g. Fig. 13; *request, define the screen, produce the screen* - col. 24 line 17-36 – Note: parsing XML from request and using both back end server – or process database -

and submitting of response processed by Universal client reads on server operable to generate application user interface; i.e. *produce a screen)*;

generating metadata associated with the interaction model (XML 308 - Fig. 13), the metadata including a reference to the data record; and storing the metadata in association with the Internet application(col. 23 lines 40-48), the Internet application being configured for access using the application user interface,

wherein each user of the plurality of users is able to modify (refer to claim 15) the data record such that the application user interface functions differently for different users.

As per claim 39, Beauchamp discloses interaction model control command (refer to claim 8).

As per claim 40, refer to claim 6.

As per claim 41, Beauchamp discloses a method of generating an application user interface, the method comprising the steps of:

accessing a page definition (XML→ Rules engine 234 – Fig 8; col 24 lines 17-22), the page definition including metadata associated with at least one customizable functional property of at least one user interface element of the application user interface (Fig 3-4; col. 4 lines 49-62 – Fig. 3-5; Fig. 14B - refer to claim 4 - Note: interface element like screen content being navigated via buttons allowing further modifying – see col 27 lines 27-60; col 27 line 61 to col. 28 line 16 - and editing by users - based intended *business process* reads on functional property characterizing personalization data being modified);

accessing a data record using the metadata (col. 24 lines 23-27), the data record being stored in a data repository (process database 206, Fig. 8) and characterizing the customizable

functional property and being modifiable by of a user of a plurality of users (user specified processes, screen name – Fig. 3; step 462 - Fig. 14B; Fig. 4-5; col. 10 line 20 to col. 11 line 30; *Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause, Cancel* – Fig 14B), the data repository being physically remote from a client device of the user(refer to claim 29) used to display the application user interface;

determining a value (e.g. Fig. 13; rule engine 234, Fig 8; col. 16 lines 37-41; step 420, 426, Fig 14A; step 432, Fig. 14B - Note: using rules engine while processing XML tags in user's request reads on determining a value characterizing customizable property - col. 4 lines 49-62; screens types – col. 13 lines 22-27) characterizing the at least one customizable functional property using the data record;

generating markup-language responsive to the determined value; and including the generated markup-language in the application user interface, the application user interface being an interface to an Internet application (XML 380- Fig .13; Fig. 14A, B; transmits the XML response – col. 24 lines 23-30),

wherein each user of the plurality of users is able to modify the data record characterizing the at least one customizable functional property (e.g. Fig. 4-5; col. 10 line 20 to col. 11 line 30; Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause, Cancel – Fig 14B)such that the application user interface including the user interface elements functions differently for different users (refer to claim 29).

As per claim 42, refer to claim 12 for modifying the data record using a personalization system.

As per claim 43, refer to claim 9 for deferred mode of communication between the client device and the Internet application

As per claim 44, refer to claim 10.

As per claim 45, Beauchamp discloses a method of personalizing an interaction model to be used with multiple application user interfaces, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting the interaction model associated with a data record and specifying interaction functionality to be associated with each application user interface, the data record characterizing the interaction model and being customizable by a user of a plurality of users on a client device (refer to claim 38), wherein the interaction model is associated with the timing of delivery (*user pauses* - col. 17 lines 51-67; col. 18, lines 38-67; Fig. 7), from the client device to an application server, of data input on the application user interface;

generating at least one application user interface using the interaction model and the data record;

generating metadata characterizing the interaction model, the metadata including a reference to the data record; and

storing the metadata in association with an application, the application being configured for access using the application user interface,

wherein each user of the plurality of users is able to modify the data record characterizing the interaction model such that the application user interface functions differently for different users;

all of which having been addressed in claim 38.

As per claim 46, Beauchamp discloses wherein a mode (pause – Fig. 3-4) of the interaction model is responsive to a command included in the application user interface.

As per claim 47, Beauchamp discloses an immediate and deferred mode (refer to claim 6).

As per claim 48, Beauchamp discloses wherein a customizable state of the interaction model is configurable to persist (col 29 lines 48-57; col 18; *manage multiple versions* - lines 13-21, lines 58-67; col 27 lines 41-60) between uses of the HTML based application user interface.

As per claim 60, Beauchamp discloses a computer implemented method of executing an Internet application, comprising the steps of:

receiving a request, from a client device of a user of a plurality of users (Fig. 13; *request, define the screen, produce the screen* - col. 24 line 17-36 – Note: parsing XML from request and using both back end metadata in request reads on receiving request to obtain application user interface; i.e. *produce a screen)* for an application user interface, the application user interface including at least one user interface element;

accessing a page definition, the page definition including metadata (refer to claim 41) associated with the application user interface;

retrieving, using the metadata, a value characterizing an interaction model associated with the user interface, the value being stored in a data repository physically remote from the client device of the user, the value further being specified by the user (Fig. 13; rule engine 234, Fig 8; col. 16 lines 37-41; step 420, 426, Fig 14A; step 432, Fig. 14B - Note: using rules engine while processing XML tags in user's request reads on retrieving based on a value characterizing

screen of interaction model associated with user interface - col. 4 lines 49-62; screens types – col. 13 lines 22-27) in order to modify interaction functionality of the application user interface,

wherein the interaction model is associated with the timing of delivery (refer to claim 6), from the client device to the Internet application, of data input on the application user interface;

generating HTML responsive to the retrieved value; including the generated HTML in the application user interface; and delivering the application user interface to the client device of the user, the application user interface being an interface between the user and the Internet application (refer to claim 41),

wherein each user of the plurality of users is able to modify the value in the data repository characterizing the interaction model (Note: XML based specifications in conjunction with process database and subsequent retrieval by server – col. 5 lines 22-30; Fig. 14A,B - of DB-retrieved screens for customization by the requesting user – Fig. 8, 13 – reads on 'able to modify value in the repository' by user based on item retrieved from interaction model represented by request and parsed XML) such that the application user interface functions differently for different users (refer to claim 29).

As per claim 61, refer to claim 9.

As per claim 62, Beauchamp discloses wherein the interaction model is specific to a user interface element (user specified 132, Pause 130; User specified 126, Next 124 – Fig. 3).

As per claim 63, Beauchamp discloses including displaying the application user interface at the client device (browser – col. 15 lines 51-65) using standard web browser protocols.

As per claim 64, refer to claim 10.

As per claim 71, Beauchamp discloses a computer implemented method of generating an application user interface configured for delivery from a server to a client device, comprising the steps of:

receiving, at the server, a request for the application user interface from the client device of a user of a plurality of users (refer to claim 60);

identifying the user requesting the application user interface, the application user interface being associated with an interaction model (Note: receiving a request for a screen based on parsing a XML reads on identifying nature of application user interface in the request), wherein the interaction model is associated with the timing of delivery (refer to claim 6), from the client device to the server, of data input on the application user interface;

accessing a page definition, the page definition including metadata associated with the application user interface (refer to claim 41);

retrieving, using the metadata and the identity of the user (logon Fig. 14A), a value for characterizing the interaction model, the value being selected by the user in order to modify interaction functionality of the application user interface, the value being stored in a data repository (refer to claim 60);

generating HTML incorporating the interaction model using the value; including the generated HTML in the application user interface; and delivering the application user interface from the server to the client device of the user (refer to claim 60), wherein each user of the plurality of users is able to modify the value in the data repository characterizing the interaction model (refer to claim 60) such that the application user interface functions differently for different users (refer to claim 29).

As per claim 72, Beauchamp discloses communicating from the client device to the server responsive to the interaction model (steps 458, 470, 472 -Fig. 14B).

As per claim 73, refer to claim 6

As per claim 74, Beauchamp discloses including displaying an interaction model control command (refer to claim 8) in the user interface.

As per claim 78, Beauchamp discloses wherein the at least one user interface element is one of text, graphics, images, fields or buttons (Fig. 3-5; Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause, Cancel – Fig 14B)

As per claims 79-80, Beauchamp discloses wherein the at least one functional property of the at least one user interface element includes one of keystroke functionality or functionality of the display buttons (refer to claim 78).

As per claim 81, Beauchamp discloses wherein the application user interface is presented to the user on the client device in a first presentation step and in a second presentation step, wherein the application user interface presented in the second presentation step is modified based on the personalization data (step 412, 416 -Fig. 14A, steps 432, 434Fig. 14B).

As per claim 83, refer to claim 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

a.

11. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauchamp et al., USPN: 6,621,505 as applied to claim 21, in view of Helgeson et al. USPN: 6,643,652 (hereinafter Helgeson).

As per claim 28, Beauchamp discloses a applicability to various protocols of communications (col. 19 lines 51-58) including interfacing with a modem or a direct modem link (col 30 line 31-39) but does not disclose wherein the client device is wireless system. Using a modem in light of the various protocols of communication at the time the invention was made suggests a modem based communication like that of a wireless device. In a method to extend the browser functionality similar to Beauchamp creating of browser metadata (Fig. 6), Helgeson discloses a client machine being a wireless device (cellular phone 411, Fig. 4). Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include in the client system of Beauchamp wireless devices as taught by Helgeson because rendering of client interface environment using metadata specified via a carrier like XML metadata would enable those wireless system to obtain support from server providers without a sustained link with such service; and thus by means of wireless protocol as taught above XML-formatted specification would provide resource-efficient support for dynamic for a as-needed basis application specification in order to render browser functionality as purported by Beauchamp, in view of the known concept that wireless devices entail restricted storage resources.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 11/07/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Following are the Examiner's observation in regard thereto.

35 USC § 103 Rejection:

(A) Applicants have submitted that Beauchamp's providing of standardized screens for reducing training teaches away from customization or personalization of screens (Appl. Rmrks Pg 18, 2nd para). It is noted that the interface framework using screens by Beauchamp does meet what 'customization' by the language of the claim in the cited portions (refer to Rejection) wherein the user modify the initial screens. Regarding the argument that Beauchamp's user clicking on navigation buttons (Appl. Rmrks pg. 18 bottom) cannot teach modifying a functional property of a personalization interface, the language regarding the term 'personalization' has been interpreted as specific to the person of user in terms of his identity as he logs on the framework for a specific instance for modifying screens. The rejection has presented sufficient element of a user interface like a button to do NEXT, PAUSE, STOP representing a functional property (emphasis added of the property derived from metadata) of a visual process being customized. The claim language is not sufficiently details to preclude the cited parts in Beauchamp from being applicable, or to render them as "teaching away".

(B) Applicants have submitted that any attempt by the users in Beauchamp to modify or customize the screens teach away from Beauchamp (Appl. Rmrks pg. 19). The cited portions has evidence how initial screens can be further customized; and the allegation about Beauchamp 'teaching away' is not being supported by a factual showing as to how a very specific teaching founded on a claim language is unequivocal clear so as to make the customized screens in Beauchamp suddenly inapposite; e.g. inapposite for meeting terms like 'personalization' or 'customization'. The argument is deemed not sufficient.

(C) Applicants have submitted that 'data' as proffered in the cited parts cannot characterize 'personalization data' (Appl. Rmrks pg. 20, top). The 'personalization data' of claim 4 has been interpreted as data specific to a session of the framework allotted to the user after a login process. This language has been deemed fulfilled. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the reference.

(D) Applicants have submitted that 'pause button' as well as other buttons in Figure 3 of Beauchamp will defy the purpose of navigation, so that the user is not modifying data being presented as standard screens (Appl. Rmrks pg. 20 bottom). The argument is related to how 'customization' and 'personalization' should be given patentable weight; and this language has been interpreted and matched according to the analysis in sections A-C.

(E) Applicants have submitted that Beauchamp Fig. 14B amounts to a scheme wherein the user is not modifying any data that is related to the functional property of a screen element (Appl. Rmrks pg 21, middle). The framework by which screens are initially presented then further reformatted by additional increment by users to meet a process has been disclosed at length using navigation buttons and *editor* to further respecify the purpose of each screen (see Beauchamp: col. 27 linrd 27-48) in terms of code editing, changing metadata, re-specifying types and association or even setup roles and structures (see col 27 line 61 to col. 28 line 16) using personalized launch pad. Suppose that functional property is data needed for a business process to be implemented, data from method class or screen type, role, source code being modified or reassigned does **read on** functional property characterizing personalization data of a developer

working on user interface element (any element on the screen) of a user interface (customized screen or framework components being instantiated for the user via his login session). The rejection is deemed fulfilling the language of 'functional property' and pertinent data being modified by Beauchamp's users.

(F) Applicants have submitted that Beauchamp's purpose for alleviating training of users in providing standardized screens would not allow modifying of data which would be unsatisfactory for the above training purpose (Appl. Rmrks gp. 23, top). There is nothing in the claim language that enforces that standardized screens would prohibit data from being modified; nor does it dictate a forced scenario that training resources in Beauchamp would be in jeopardy should any attempt of modifying of standardized screens by the developers be allowed. The modifying of data issue has been addressed in section E, and interpretation of the broad language of 'data' characterizing a 'functional property' has been analyzed therein. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the reference.

(G) Applicants have submitted that Beauchamp does not teach 'user profile interface' (Appl. Rmrks pg; 23 middle). The current rejection has addressed how this limitation would have been obvious.

(H) Applicants have submitted that col. 21, Fig. 16 rules 604, col. 18 and Fig. 8 in Beauchamp fail to teach or suggest 'personalization data characterizing a functional property' and modifiable in terms of allowing 'the user to modify personalization data' (Appl. Rmrks pg. 23 to pg. 25, top). The argument is referred back to sections A-F from above.

(I) Applicants have submitted that Beauchamp in view of Fig. 8, 13, 14B, NEXT, PREVIOUS, ASSIGN, PAUSE, CANCEL and Business transactions cannot be deemed as teaching 'personalization data … functional property … application user interface'(Appl. Rmrks pg. 25). This rehash of a previous argument will be referred to the pertinent response in the above sections.

(J) Applicants have introduced some dependent claim amendment and proffer that in light of Beauchamp deficiencies in the base claims (Appl. Rmrks pg. 26-27) The argument is not commensurate with the previous Office Action.

USC § 102 Rejection:

(K) Applicants have introduced claim amendment and submitted that Beauchamp does not support modifying of 'data' in the 'functional property' context (Appl. Rmrks pg. 28, middle to pg. 30) in light of the cited portions (Fig. 3, col. 18, col 24; Fig. 13, Fig. 4-5, col. 10; Fig. 14B). All of the cited portions appear to be retrieve from an Office action not addressing the current set of claims or language; hence are deemed mootly applied. As far as 'allow the user to modify data … functional property', this has been discussed at length. Besides, claim 15 as amended has necessitated a new set of cited portions; rendering the above argument premature and unapplicable.

In all, the claims as amended have been deemed met or rendered obvious as per the current Office Action. Applicants' arguments for failing to point out how the broadly claim language is deemed distinguishing over Beauchamp amount to insufficient weight or evidence in order to overcome the grounds of rejection now effectuated.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4:30PM/Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis Bullock can be reached on (571)272-3759.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-3735 (for non-official correspondence - please consult Examiner before using) or 571-273-8300 (for official correspondence) or redirected to customer service at 571-272-3609.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.
Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Tuan A Vu/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2193

December 21, 2008